Interview Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	09/843,630	NISHIYAMA, KAZUO
	Examiner	Art Unit
	James M. Mitchell	2813
All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):		
(1) <u>James M. Mitchell</u> .	(3)	
(2) <u>Bob Depke</u> .	(4)	
Date of Interview: <u>03 February 2005</u> .		
Type: a)⊠ Telephonic b)□ Video Conference c)□ Personal [copy given to: 1)□ applicant 2)□ applicant's representative]		
Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☐ No. If Yes, brief description:		
Claim(s) discussed:		
Identification of prior art discussed:		
Agreement with respect to the claims f)☐ was reached. g)☒ was not reached. h)☐ N/A.		
Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: <u>See Continuation Sheet</u> .		
(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)		
THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.		
	· · · - · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	
		·
/		
Warfing Note: You must sign this form unless it is an		
Éxaminer Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.	Examiner's sign	ature, if required

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Applicant wanted to make sure its latest IDS was considered in this application and to discuss its relevancy against an application that would be filed as a continuation. Examiner indicated that the IDS would be considered in this application and that any indication of allowability would have to be re-evaluated, Examiner then informed applicant that a later interview should be conducted when the continuation is filed, so that applicant could discuss it with the examiner handling that case.